



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/810,373

03/26/2004

Larkin Hill Lowrey

0307091.0177

8632

35602

7590

07/10/2006

STEPHEN C. GLAZIER
KIRKPATRICK & LOCKHART NICHOLSON GRAHAN LLP
1601 K STREET, NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20006

EXAMINER

BEAULIEU, YONEL

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3661

DATE MAILED: 07/10/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/810,373

Applicant(s)

LOWREY ET AL.

Examiner

Yonel Beaulieu

Art Unit

3661

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 April 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-48 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-48 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 4/7/06.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 - 48 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1 – 9, 12, 14 - 17, 19 – 29, 32, 34 – 37, 39 – 42, and 44 – 48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lawrence et al. (US 6 505 106 B1) in view of Chutorash (US 6 020 654 A).

Regarding claims 1 - 4, 9, 12, 19, 20, 22 - 24, 29, 32, 40, 42, 44 - 46, Lawrence et al. teaches an in-vehicle (on-board) telematics system (figs. 1-2 at least) comprising a controller (28; controller 28 is inherently covered by a housing); a diagnostics system (22), communicating with the controller (28; fig. 2), configured to receive diagnostic information from a host vehicle (15; fig. 1; col. 3, lines 16 – 19 at least); a position-locating system (GPS receiver 24), communicating with the controller (see fig. 2), configured to determine the host vehicle's location information (col. 3, lines 52 – 65 at least); a communication interface (item 36) configured to send additional information to a peripheral system/serial interface (server 18) other than the diagnostic and position-

locating systems; a short-range transmitter (14) configured to send information to the external peripheral device (18); a long-range wireless transmitter (26), communicating with the controller, configured to transmit information through a wireless network to an Internet-accessible website (fig. 1; col. 3, lines 32 – 47 at least); an LCD display (col. 5, lines 5 – 10 at least provides for conventional displays); and a voice interface (not explicitly shown) configured to send voice information (the system is configured to send voice data using telephone network 16; col. 3, lines 20 – 31).

Regarding claims 5, 6, 25, and 26, Lawrence et al. further teaches displaying a text message on the display and receiving such from the Internet-accessible website (see fig. 3; col. 4, lines 37 – 50 at least).

Regarding claims 7 and 27, Lawrence et al. further teaches capability of receiving messages from a cellular telephone or a personal digital assistant (col. 4, lines 6 – 19 at least).

Regarding claims 8 and 28, Lawrence's display is configured to mount inside the vehicle (data are displayed to the vehicle operator; thus, the display being mounted inside the vehicle; note col. 5, lines 5 – 8 at least).

Regarding claims 21 and 39, Lawrence's controller (22) is a microprocessor or a microcontroller (col. 5, lines 58 – 64 at least).

Regarding claims 47 and 48, Lawrence et al. further teaches a speech-recognition module configured to analyze a user's speech (item 146 in fig. 7 provides for such an analysis).

Regarding claims 14 – 17 and 34 – 37, Lawrence et al. further teaches a button (user serial interface 142) that sends a signal (via connectivity 162; col. 8, lines 3 – 8 at least); a secondary wireless modem being a satellite modem (Lawrence teaches telephone network 16 in connection with GPS and the Internet; col. 3, lines 29 – 33 and 52 – 58 at least).

Regarding claim 41, Lawrence's system further includes a cable (landline) that sends information to and receives information from the external peripheral system (a transceiver sends and receives data; note col. 3, lines 19 – 21 at least).

Regarding the above claims, Lawrence does not teach universal configuration of the communication interface with different peripheral devices.

However, Chutorash teaches, in the same field of endeavor of in-vehicle diagnostics system, an universal configuration of the communication interface with different peripheral devices (figs. 1 and 4 at least; col. 1: 66 – col. 2: 21 and, in particular, col. 2: 38 – 65).

Art Unit: 3661

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Lawrence's teaching by including an universal configuration of the communication interface with different peripheral devices as evidenced by Chutorash in order to enhance diagnosing various in-vehicle devices.

Claims 10, 11, 13, 18, 30, 31, 38, and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lawrence '106 B1 and Chutorash ('654 A), as applied to claims 1, 22, and 42 and further in view of Baratono et al. (US 6,889,064 B2).

As discussed above, Lawrence and Chutorash teach all of the limitations except for the hands-free, BluetoothTM, and infrared features and the serial interface being RS232 interface.

However, Baratono et al. teaches, in the same field of endeavor of in-vehicle telematics system (col. 5, line 63 – col. 6, line 9 and col. 6, lines 22 – 34), hands-free, BluetoothTM, and infrared features (col. 1, lines 20 – 27 and 46 – 54; col. 6, lines 35 – 43; and col. 7, lines 29 – 51).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Lawrence's and Chutorash's teachings by including hands-free, BluetoothTM, and infrared features as evidenced by Baratono in order to enhance versatility of the system.

As to the RS232 interface, such is old and well-known (see for example US 2005/0144318).

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Yonel Beaulieu whose telephone number is (571) 272-

Art Unit: 3661

6955. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon., Wed. & Thur. between 0900 and 1600.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thomas BLACK can be reached on (571) 272-6956. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.


Yonel Beaulieu
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3661